

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended, claim 2 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter found therein, and claim 23 is added. No new matter has been added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesy shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Huffman in the June 1, 2006, personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Applicant also appreciates the indication that claims 4, 7-9, 13, and 14 are allowable and claims 11, 12, and 15-22 are allowed. Applicant respectfully submits that all the claims are allowable for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,454,390 to Takahashi et al. (Takahashi). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed at the interview, Takahashi fails to disclose wherein the best pattern printing instructing unit causes the printing unit to reprint the selected best test pattern from the scanned-in test patterns on the printing medium at the test pattern printing interval that produces the selected best test pattern as information indicating the image of the selected best test pattern, as recited in claim 1.

As agreed at the interview, Takahashi prints three printing patterns, two of the printing patterns are for adjusting while the third is a confirmation pattern, which confirms a success in the dot alignment (col. 41, lines 45-54). The two additional print patterns (i.e., coarse adjustment and fine adjustment) are only test patterns that have been set automatically through a series of automatic dot alignment sequences controlled by an algorithm (col. 41, lines 59-67). However, as agreed at the interview, Takahashi does not reprint the selected best test pattern from the scanned-in test patterns on the printing medium at the test pattern

printing interval that produces the selected best test pattern as information indicating the image of the selected best test pattern.

Thus, Takahashi does not literally disclose each and every feature of Applicant's claimed invention as recited in claim 1 and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is inappropriate.

Because Takahashi does not anticipate or suggest the features as recited in claim 1, Takahashi cannot anticipate the subject matter of claims 3, 5, 6, and 10, which depend from claim 1, for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as for the additional features recited therein. Likewise, as agreed at the interview, Takahashi does not disclose "wherein the image printed on the printing medium includes a confirmation pattern that corresponds to the selected best test pattern and its number of shift dots", as recited in new claim 23. Thus, claim 23 is also patentable over Takahashi for at least the reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. With respect to claim 2, the cancellation of claim 2 renders the rejection moot. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-23 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Kurt P. Goudy  
Registration No. 52,954

JAO:KPG/tbm

Attachment:  
Amendment Transmittal

Date: June 15, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--